

CLICK HERE FOR LETTER

CLICK HERE FOR REPORT FROM REGIONAL PLANNING

CLICK HERE FOR SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH'S MOTION

January 12, 2005

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Supervisors:

**HEARING ON AMENDMENTS TO COUNTY CODE TITLE 22 (PLANNING AND ZONING)
RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW STANDARDS FOR THE LIMITED SHARING OF
WATER WELLS
(ALL SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICTS) (3-VOTES)**

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD, AFTER THE PUBLIC HEARING:

1. Consider the attached Negative Declaration together with any comments received during the public review process, find on the basis of the entire record before the Board that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment, find that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Board, and adopt the Negative Declaration.
2. Approve the recommendation of the Regional Planning Commission as reflected in the attached draft ordinance to establish new case processing procedures and standards for the sharing of water wells in certain residential and agricultural zones; determine that the proposed amendments are consistent with the Los Angeles County General Plan.
3. Find that the adoption of the proposed amendments to Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code is *de minimus* in its effect on fish and wildlife resources; and authorize the Director of Planning to complete and file a Certificate of Fee Exemption for the project.
4. Instruct County Counsel to prepare an ordinance to amend Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code as recommended by the Commission.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
January 12, 2005

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

At your March 9, 2004 meeting, your Board was concerned that in some outlying areas of Los Angeles County there have been instances where property owners have wanted to construct a new dwelling unit on a vacant lot only to find out that there is no water well capability on that lot and instances where an owner of a lot with an established dwelling unit has run out of water because their well is no longer producing. In some instances, the adjoining property contains a well with sufficient capacity to supply its own water needs and those of its neighbors. In order to share a water well, the current County zoning regulations require a conditional use permit (CUP) application. Because the CUP case processing procedure is sometimes difficult, costly and time-consuming, the Board, on a motion of Supervisor Antonovich, directed the Department of Regional Planning and the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) to draft and recommend, respectively, an ordinance for your consideration that would streamline current zoning application procedures for the sharing of water wells. The Board suggested that the CUP requirement should be eliminated in favor of a new modified director's review application procedure in appropriate instances.

In accordance with the Board's direction, the attached proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments would establish such a streamlined zoning application procedure for the limited sharing of water wells.

Implementation of Countywide Strategic Plan Goals

This proposed ordinance would promote the County's Strategic Plan goal of Service Excellence by establishing a coordinated and interdepartmental response to limited water availability problems in outlying non-urban areas. The ordinance would establish a streamlined and less costly procedure for processing shared water well zoning applications.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

Implementation of the proposed amendments to streamline the application procedure for shared water wells would not have any fiscal impacts upon the County or this Department because the reduced fee would correspond directly with the reduced case processing time for such applications.

No request for financing is being made in connection with this proposed ordinance.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
January 12, 2005

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

Regional Planning Commission Recommendation

The RPC held a public hearing on September 22, 2004 to consider the proposed ordinance. Representatives of the Departments of Health Services and Public Works and the Fire Department

testified in support of the ordinance at the hearing. During the public hearing, staff pointed out that the Zoning Ordinance currently requires a CUP for the sharing of water wells even on a limited basis. The CUP case processing procedure includes notification of surrounding property owners, an environmental review pursuant to requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and a public hearing. Additionally, such a CUP requirement is generally applied to land uses that present potential incompatibilities with their surrounding land uses, such as obtrusive noise and fumes, increased traffic and other potential nuisances. The limited sharing of water wells does not display such incompatibilities with surrounding properties. The RPC closed the public hearing, and asked staff to research several issues and return to the Commission with a revised ordinance.

For these reasons, on December 15, 2004, after a discussion of the issues raised at the September 22 public hearing, the RPC recommended deletion of the current CUP requirement in favor of a modified director's review procedure for the sharing of water wells in certain instances. This new application procedure would be available for the sharing of a water well within a maximum of four dwelling units located on lots immediately adjoining that lot containing the well. The proposed ordinance amendments would be applicable in Zones R-1, R-2, R-A, A-1 and A-2 only and would contain the following major features:

- A discretionary director's review procedure would be used to process applications. This procedure:
 - would not require a public hearing;
 - would provide notification to surrounding property owners;
 - would require approval in concept by the Departments of Health Services and Public Works and the Fire Department;
 - would require a hydrology report to assess the water quality and quantity conditions of the well;
 - would establish conditions for an access easements, covenants, assumption of risk, and reports relating to well operation and bacteriology to protect the public health, safety and general welfare;
 - would be subject to appeals and calls for review to the RPC and the Board of Supervisors;
 - would include a fee of \$1,191.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
January 12, 2005

- An environmental review in conformance with CEQA would be performed for each application.

Public Hearing and Notice

A public hearing is required pursuant to Section 22.16.200 of the County Code and Sections 65856 and 66016 of the Government Code. Required notice must be given pursuant to the requirements set forth in Section 22.60.174 of the County Code. The County Code Procedures exceed the minimum standards of Government Code Sections 6061, 65090, 65856, and 66016 relating to notice of public hearing.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

The attached Initial Study concludes that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before your Board, that the adoption of the proposed ordinance may have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, in accordance with Section 15070 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a Negative Declaration was prepared. A copy of the proposed Negative Declaration has been transmitted to 80 public libraries for public review. Public notice was published in 13 newspapers of general circulation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21092. No comments on the proposed Negative Declaration were received during the public review period.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

The proposed ordinance would streamline the current zoning application procedure for the limited sharing of a water well by eliminating the current CUP requirement in favor of a modified director's review procedure. This would reduce the cost and case processing time for related applicants, thereby making water more available to them. For these reasons the proposed ordinance would improve the County's service to its residents.

If you have any questions regarding this proposed ordinance, please call me or Leonard Erlanger of my staff at (213) 974-6432.

Respectfully submitted,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

James E. Hartl, AICP
Director of Planning

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
January 12, 2005

JEH:RDH:RS

Attachments

1. Resolution of the Regional Planning Commission
2. Project Summary
3. Ordinance Recommended by the Regional Planning Commission
4. Negative Declaration and related Initial Study
5. Board Motions dated December 16, 2004 and March 9, 2004
6. Report to the Board dated February 18, 2004
7. Summary of the Proceedings of the Regional Planning Commission
8. Legal Notice of Board Hearing

c: Chief Administrative Officer
County Counsel
Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors

Auditor-Controller
Director, Department of Health Services
Director, Department of Public Works
Fire Chief, Fire Department

Shared Wells Board Letter 8 1/12/05

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

PROJECT SUMMARY

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION: Proposed amendments to Title 22 (Planning and Zoning) establishing new streamlined case processing procedures for the sharing of a water well by two to four dwelling units located on the lot that contains the well and on up to three lots that immediately adjoin that lot in certain residential and agricultural zones.

REQUEST: Approve the proposed amendments to Title 22.

LOCATION: Countywide

STAFF CONTACT: Mr. Leonard Erlanger at (213) 974-6432.

RPC MEETING DATE: September 22, 2004 and December 15, 2004

RPC RECOMMENDATION: Board Hearing and approval of proposed ordinance amendment.

MEMBERS VOTING AYE: Bellamy, Valadez, Helsley, Modugno, Rew

MEMBERS VOTING NAY: None

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

KEY ISSUES: Previously, the County has required a CUP for even the limited sharing of water wells. The proposed ordinance would eliminate the CUP requirement and establish a director's review procedure for the limited sharing of water wells in certain residential and agricultural zones.

MAJOR POINTS FOR: The ordinance would eliminate the CUP requirement for the sharing of a water well in favor of a modified director's review procedure, making such applications less costly, time-consuming and difficult for residents who run out of water or want to construct a residence on a lot that lacks water.

MAJOR POINTS AGAINST: None

RESOLUTION

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

WHEREAS, the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles has conducted a public hearing on September 22, 2004 and further discussed on December 15, 2004 the matter of amendments to Title 22 (Planning and Zoning) of the Los Angeles County Code relating to shared water wells; and

WHEREAS, the Commission finds as follows:

1. The County Zoning Ordinance currently requires a conditional use permit (CUP) for the sharing of water wells in residential and agricultural zones.
2. In some rural areas, water is not available on a lot or parcel of land where a property owner seeks to construct a residence, or the well serving an existing residence has run dry. In such cases, a person who requests an adjoining property owner to share their well must apply for a CUP.

3. The Board of Supervisors has expressed its concern that the current CUP requirement for the sharing of water wells may be a difficult process for an applicant because of its cost, the processing time and the required public hearing. For this reason, the Board has requested that the Regional Planning Commission consider a more streamlined zoning application procedure that would be appropriate for the limited sharing of a well.
4. The CUP requirement is typically intended for proposed land uses that have some potential incompatibilities with surrounding land uses, and shared water wells do not appear to present such compatibility problems. For this reason, the proposed ordinance amendments would establish a modified director's review procedure for the sharing of a single water well between two to four dwelling units located on the lot that contains the well and on up to three adjoining lots in certain residential and agricultural zones.
5. The proposed ordinance amendments will allow the director to approve an application without a public hearing, which will reduce processing time and costs. It will also protect health and safety by requiring the property owners of all lots containing dwelling units that will share the well to delineate how the water will be shared and for what purposes, and require an access easement from the property owner of the lot where the well is located in favor of the owners of the affected adjoining lots.
6. Additionally, any proposed shared water well would be subject to the requirements of the County Departments of Health Services, Public Works and Fire.
7. Potential impacts on biota, water quantity, water quality, fire services and private sewage disposal, as well as possible growth inducement related to the sharing of water wells, should be subject to an environmental assessment pursuant to the requirements of the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). For this reason, the newly established director's review procedure would be considered discretionary and subject to CEQA, and would require the director to make discretionary findings in approving an application.
8. The proposed ordinance amendments would address the concerns of the Board of Supervisors in that they provide for a streamlined application procedure for the limited sharing of water wells and, at the same time, include environmental and regulatory safeguards that will protect against potential negative effects.
9. The proposed ordinance amendments are compatible with and supportive of the policies of the Los Angeles County General Plan in that it provides needed services to the residents of unincorporated areas of the County.
10. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning has prepared a Negative Declaration for this project. The Commission finds that these proposed amendments to the County Code will not have a significant effect on the environment pursuant to CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines and the Los Angeles County Environmental Document and Reporting Procedures and Guidelines. The Commission further finds that the project is *de minimus* in its effect on fish and wildlife.

resources and the project is exempt from the payment of State Department of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.2 of the California Fish and Game Code.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Regional Planning Commission recommends to the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles as follows:

1. That the Board hold a public hearing to consider the proposed amendments to Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code that would streamline the zoning application procedure for the limited sharing of water wells in certain residential and agricultural zones;
2. That the Board adopt the attached Negative Declaration and find that the proposed amendments to Title 22 will not have a significant effect on the environment;
3. That the Board of Supervisors find that the adoption of the proposed ordinance amendment is *de minimus* in its effect on fish and wildlife resources, and authorize the Director of Planning to complete and file a Certificate of Fee Exemption for the project; and
4. That the Board adopt an ordinance containing modifications to Title 22 as recommended by this Commission, and determine that the modifications are compatible with and supportive of the goals and policies of the Los Angeles County General Plan.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles on December 15, 2004.

Rosie O. Ruiz, Secretary
Regional Planning Commission
County of Los Angeles

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
320 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT NUMBER: Shared Water Wells Ordinance

1. DESCRIPTION: The proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance (Title 22 of the County Code) would establish new streamlined case processing procedures for proposed sharing of a single water well between two to four dwelling units located on the lot that contains the well and on up to three lots adjoining that lot in certain residential and agricultural zones.

2. LOCATION: Countywide.

3. PROPONENT: Initiated by the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors.

4. FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:
BASED ON THE INITIAL STUDY, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.

5. THE LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS ON WHICH ADOPTION OF THIS NEGATIVE DECLARATION IS BASED IS: DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING, 320 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

PREPARED BY: Leonard Erlanger
Ordinance Studies Section

DATE: 1/18/2005

PROJECT NUMBER: Shared Water Wells

CASES: Case Number ADV-T00400001
Ordinance Amendment



*** INITIAL STUDY ***

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: N/A Staff Member: Jaime Cuevas

Thomas Guide: Countywide USGS Quad: Countywide

Location: Countywide

Description of Project: Draft Shared Water Well Ordinance – The draft ordinance amendments would streamline the zoning application requirements for the sharing of a single water well between two to four dwelling units located on the lot that contains the well and on up to three lots that immediately adjoining that lot in certain residential and agricultural zones. (The draft ordinance amendments are attached.)

Gross Area: Countywide

Environmental Setting: Countywide.

Zoning: Zones R-1, R-2, R-A, A-1 and A-2.

General Plan: Countywide

Community/Areawide Plan: Countywide

Major projects in area:

<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Description & Status</u>
<u>N/A</u>	<u></u>
<u></u>	<u></u>

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies

- None
- Regional Water Quality Control Board
 - Los Angeles Region
 - Lahontan Region
- Coastal Commission
- Army Corps of Engineers
- _____

Trustee Agencies

- None
- State Fish and Game
- State Parks
-
-

Special reviewing Agencies

- None
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- National Parks
- National Forest
- Edwards Air Force Base

- Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mountains
- State of California Water Resource Board.
- _____

Regional Significance

- None
- SCAG Criteria
- Air Quality
- Water Resources
- Santa Monica Mtns Area

County Reviewing Agencies

- Subdivision Committee
- Public Works_____
- Health Services_____
- Fire Department_____
- _____

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX

		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)			
		Pg		Less than Significant Impact/No Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation
CATEGORY	FACTOR			Potentially Significant Impact	Potential Concern
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	✓		
	2. Flood	6	✓		
	3. Fire	7	✓		
	4. Noise	8	✓		
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	✓		
	2. Air Quality	10	✓		
	3. Biota	11	✓		
	4. Cultural Resources	12	✓		
	5. Mineral Resources	13	✓		
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	✓		
	7. Visual Qualities	15	✓		
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	✓		
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	✓		
	3. Education	18	✓		
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	✓		
	5. Utilities	20	✓		
OTHER	1. General	21	✓		
	2. Environmental Safety	22	✓		
	3. Land Use	23	✓		
	4. Pop./Housing/Empl./Recr.	24	✓		
	Mandatory Findings	25	✓		

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

*

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

- Development Policy Map Designation: The ordinance amendment will apply countywide.
- Yes No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
- Yes No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

- Check if DMS printout generated (attached) Date of printout: _____
- Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

* EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

- NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

- MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Condition Form included as part of this Initial Study.

- ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant".

- At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: Jaime Cuevas Date: June 1, 2004

Approved by: Leonard Erlanger Date: June 1, 2004

- Determination appealed See attached sheet.

*
NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone?

<u>There are known fault zones within the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County.</u> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?

<u>There are known major landslide areas within the unincorporated areas of L.A. County.</u> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?

<u>There are known areas having high slope instability within the unincorporated areas of L.A. County.</u> |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?

<u>There a</u> |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?

_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%?

_____ |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

_____ |
| h. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____ |

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

- Building Ordinance No. 2225 □ Sections 308B, 309, 310 and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

- Lot Size Project Design Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

This draft ordinance does not constitute proposed construction of a site specific land use project. It provides that future proposed water wells will be subject to environmental review on a project specific basis, and that they are subject to approval in concept by the Department of Health Services, Department of Public Works and the Fire Department.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

Potentially significant impact

Less than significant with project mitigation

Less than significant/No



HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?
<u>There are major drainage courses located within the unincorporated area of Los Angeles County</u> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain or designated flood hazard zone?
<u>There are major floodway, floodplain and designated flood hazard zones within the unincorporated area of Los Angeles County</u> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?
_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off?
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors (e.g., dam failures)? _____ |

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

- Building Ordinance No. 2225 § Section 308A Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)
 Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

- Lot Size Project Design

This draft ordinance does not constitute proposed construction of a site specific land use project. It provides that future proposed water wells will be subject to environmental review on a project specific basis, and that they are subject to approval in concept by the Department of Health Services, Department of Public Works and the Fire Department.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in a high fire hazard area (Fire Zone 4)?
<u>There are high fire hazard areas within the unincorporated areas of L.A. County.</u> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, widths, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area? _____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? <u>There are areas having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire hazard conditions within the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County.</u> |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?
_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?
_____ |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
_____ |

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

- Water Ordinance No. 7834 Fire Ordinance No. 2947 Fire Prevention Guide No. 46

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

- Project Design Compatible Use

This draft ordinance does not constitute proposed construction of a site specific land use project. It provides that future proposed water wells will be subject to environmental review on a project specific basis, and that they are subject to approval in concept by the Department of Health Services, Department of Public Works and the Fire Department.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?
<hr/> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?
<hr/> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?
<hr/> |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?
<u>Only during short term events such as utility outages and severe wind storms.</u>
<hr/> |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
<hr/>
<hr/> |

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

- Noise Ordinance No. 11778 Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

- Lot Size Project Design Compatibility
-

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact
-

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?

<u>Areas of Los Angeles County are known to have water quality problems.</u> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?

<u>Public sewer is not available in all areas of Los Angeles County.</u> |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations <i>or</i> is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?

<u>Some areas of Los Angeles County have septic limitations.</u> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the projects associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or stormwater runoff to the stormwater conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies?

_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the projects post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of stormwater runoff and/or could post-development non-stormwater discharges contribute potential pollutants to the stormwater conveyance system and/or receiving bodies?

_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____ |

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Waste Permit | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health Code <input type="checkbox"/> Ordinance No. 7583, Chapter 5 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plumbing Code <input type="checkbox"/> Ordinance No. 2269 | <input type="checkbox"/> NPDES Permit CAS 614001 Compliance (DPW) |

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lot Size | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Design |
|--|--|

This draft ordinance does not constitute proposed construction of a site specific land use project. It provides that future proposed water wells will be subject to environmental review on a project specific basis, and that they are subject to approval in concept by the Department of Health Services, Department of Public Works and the Fire Department. All new water wells must satisfy Department of Health Services potable water requirements.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **water quality** problems?

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially significant | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than significant with project mitigation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than significant/No impact |
|--|--|---|

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential uses or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)? |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure <i>or</i> exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook? |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources which create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions? |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? |
| h. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors: _____ |

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

- Health and Safety Code Section 40506

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

- Project Design Air Quality Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **air quality**?

- Potentially significant impact Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

- a. Yes No Maybe Is the project site located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), *or* is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?
Many areas of Los Angeles County are relatively natural and undisturbed.
- b. Yes No Maybe Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?
New residential units in areas of very high fire hazard severity will require implementation of f
- c. Yes No Maybe Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue, dashed line, located on the project site?
Water wells may be located near drainage course as a source of high ground water.
- d. Yes No Maybe Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g., coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian woodland, wetland, etc.)?
Water wells near drainage course may have sensitive riparian vegetation.
- e. Yes No Maybe Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?
There are oak and other unique native trees in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County.
- f. Yes No Maybe Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?

- g. Yes No Maybe Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)? _____

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Lot Size Project Design Oak Tree Permit ERB/SEATAC Review

This draft ordinance does not constitute proposed construction of a site specific land use project. It provides that future proposed water wells will be subject to environmental review on a project specific basis, and that they are subject to approval in concept by the Department of Health Services, Department of Public Works and the Fire Department. Property owners must comply with all protections in the Fish and Game Codes.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **biotic resources**?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Palaeontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) which indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?

<u>There are areas that contain known archaeological resources or that contain features (drainage</u> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential palaeontological resources?

_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?

_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource defined in Section 15064.5?

_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique palaeontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____

_____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Lot Size Project Design Archaeology Report

This draft ordinance does not constitute proposed construction of a site specific land use project. It provides that future proposed water wells will be subject to environmental review on a project specific basis, and that they are subject to approval in concept by the Department of Health Services, Department of Public Works and the Fire Department.

CONCLUSION

Considering the, above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical, or palaeontological** resources?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 5. Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
_____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Lot Size Project Design

This draft ordinance does not constitute proposed construction of a site specific land use project. It provides that future proposed water wells will be subject to environmental review on a project specific basis, and that they are subject to approval in concept by the Department of Health Services, Department of Public Works and the Fire Department.

CONCLUSION

Considering the, above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
<hr/> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
<hr/> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
<hr/> |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
<hr/> |

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Lot Size Project Design

This draft ordinance does not constitute proposed construction of a site specific land use project. It provides that future proposed water wells will be subject to environmental review on a project specific basis, and that they are subject to approval in concept by the Department of Health Services, Department of Public Works and the Fire Department.

CONCLUSION

Considering the, above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), <i>or</i> is it located within a scenic corridor, <i>or</i> will it otherwise impact the viewshed?
<u>Water tanks and other equipment associated with water wells may occasionally obstruct views</u> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area which contains unique aesthetic features?
_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project likely to obstruct unique views from surrounding residential uses? |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?
_____ |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)? |

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Lot Size Project Design Visual Report Compatible Use

This draft ordinance does not constitute proposed construction of a site specific land use project. It provides that future proposed water wells will be subject to environmental review on a project specific basis, and that they are subject to approval in concept by the Department of Health Services, Department of Public Works and the Fire Department.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact
-

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project contain 25 dwelling units or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (mid-block or intersections)?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?
_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?
_____ |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Project Design Traffic Report Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division
-

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **traffic/access** factors?

- Potentially significant impact Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____

_____ |

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

- Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste Ordinance No. 6130
- Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

- Potentially significant impact Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools which will serve the project site?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create student transportation problems?
_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____

_____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Site Dedication Government Code Section 65995
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

- Potentially significant impact Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____

_____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Fire Mitigation Fees

This draft ordinance does not constitute proposed construction of a site specific land use project. It provides that future proposed water wells will be subject to environmental review on a project specific basis, and that they are subject to approval in concept by the Department of Health Services, Department of Public Works and the Fire Department.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

- Potentially significant impact Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?
The ordinance amendments will primarily be applicable to areas that have inadequate water supply
- b. Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?
There are areas known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting
- c. Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?
Utility service demand will increase slightly in areas where shared well approvals facilitate con
- d. Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?
- e. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?
- f. Other factors? _____

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

- Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269 Water Code Ordinance No. 7834

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

- Lot Size Project Design

This draft ordinance does not constitute proposed construction of a site specific land use project. It provides that future proposed water wells will be subject to environmental review on a project specific basis, and that they are subject to approval in concept by the Department of Health Services, Department of Public Works and the Fire Department.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities/services**?

- Potentially significant impact Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?

- b. Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
This ordinance would allow a small number of new dwelling units in areas that are currently no
- c. Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?

- d. Other factors? _____

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

Lot size Project Design Compatible Use

This draft ordinance does not constitute proposed construction of a site specific land use project. It provides that future proposed water wells will be subject to environmental review on a project specific basis, and that they are subject to approval in concept by the Department of Health Services, Department of Public Works and the Fire Department.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors? _____

Potentially significant impact Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?
_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Have there been previous uses which indicate residual soil toxicity of the site?
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous material into the environment?
_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
_____ |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
_____ |
| h. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
_____ |
| i. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
_____ |
| j. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Toxic Clean-up Plan

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

- Potentially significant impact Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- a. Yes No Maybe Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?

- b. Yes No Maybe Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?

- c. _____ Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
- Yes No Maybe Hillside Management Criteria?
- Yes No Maybe SEA Conformance Criteria?
- Yes No Maybe Other? _____
- d. Yes No Maybe Would the project physically divide an established community?

- e. Yes No Maybe Other factors? _____

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

This draft ordinance does not constitute proposed construction of a site specific land use project. It provides that future proposed water wells will be subject to environmental review on a project specific basis, and that they are subject to approval in concept by the Department of Health Services, Department of Public Works and the Fire Department.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

- Potentially significant impact Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
<hr/> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?
<u>The shared well ordinance will permit a small number of new dwelling units to be built on par</u> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
<hr/> |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
<hr/> |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
<hr/> |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
<hr/> |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
<hr/> |

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

This draft ordinance does not constitute proposed construction of a site specific land use project. It provides that future proposed water wells will be subject to environmental review on a project specific basis, and that they are subject to approval in concept by the Department of Health Services, Department of Public Works and the Fire Department.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment, or recreational** factors?

- Potentially significant impact Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

Yes No Maybe

- a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- b. Does the project have possible environmental effects which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

- c. Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

- Potentially significant significant/No impact
- Less than significant with project mitigation
- Less than

**SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS OF
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
ON THE DRAFT
SHARED WATER WELL ORDINANCE**

Proceedings of 9/22/04 and 12/15/04

September 22, 2004

Staff presented to the Commission the draft of the Shared Water Well Ordinance. Under proposed provisions, property owners with water wells would be allowed to share the well with up to three adjoining property owners after approval of a modified discretionary Director's Review application instead of the previously required Conditional Use Permit.

The following points of the draft ordinance were presented to the Commission:

- Environmental review procedures required by CEQA would be retained as previously required under the Conditional Use Permit (CUP).
- A hydrology report would be required.
- The applicant would be required to record an access easement over their lot in favor of the owners of the other adjoining lots that will be sharing the well.
- The applicant would be required to record covenant signed by owners of adjoining lots that will share well, specifying water use, quantities, well maintenance, etc.
- Property owners of lots within 1,000 feet of the lot with the well, and adjoining lots to sharing the well, would be notified of shared well application.
- The director would consider written comments of notified property owners prior to making a determination on the application.
- The director could make a decision without a public hearing.
- Appeals to a Hearing Officer, the Commission and the Board would be allowed.
- The new fee would be approximately 25 percent of the previous CUP fee.

The Commission discussion included: the appropriate zoning permit for wells within 300 feet of schools; fees for appeal of Director's decision; the adequacy of the 1,000-foot radius notification and whether or not the notification radius should be adjusted based on size of underground water source; how the County would enforce a contingency plan; the number of water service connections on one well; and, the State definition of a small water company.

Staff responded to Commission by stating that: the proposed ordinance has adequate health and safety safeguards to review impacts on schools; the fee for appeal of director's review should not be higher than appeals for most other cases. Staff would research the notification radius issue, contingency plan, multiple connections on one well and the classification of a State small water company on one

lot. Fire Department staff addressed the Commission's concerns about fire suppression-related water tanks.

Department of Health Services (DHS) staff testified before Commission regarding: its proposed guidelines for flow testing of wells, the peer hydrologist review procedure, the different types of underground water sources, options if a well runs dry, how guest houses would not be considered a separate water connection but a second unit or senior citizen's residence would be, the State criteria for a small water company, the lack of inspection programs of previously approved wells, and the availability of records related to drilling and flow testing of wells.

DHS staff also discussed well water flow and infrastructure requirements and stated that normally a 3-gallon/minute flow is required of a well for each connection but a 2-gallon/minute flow is considered sufficient if an auxiliary tank of at least 1,500 gallons is provided for each connection. DHS indicated that the Department of Public Works signs off on the infrastructure—well construction, pumps, tanks and pipes—prior to final flow testing by DHS, and that a retesting is required for an approved well that is proposed for sharing to more than one connection.

After deliberation over the presentations by the County Departments and indicating its satisfaction over safeguard measures included in the draft ordinance, the Commission closed the hearing and asked staff to report back on the questions that were raised and that a revised draft ordinance be brought back for approval.

December 15, 2004

The Commission discussed the staff's response to questions and comments raised at the hearing on September 22, 2004 and the revised draft ordinance prepared by staff. The issue of the appropriate notification radius was addressed by the staff's recommendation of a 1,500-foot notification radius. Staff explained that it is difficult to accurately determine exactly which property owners would be affected by any well because of the varied nature of aquifers. However, the large radius proposed by staff should be adequate in most cases because of the larger parcel sizes in the rural areas where water wells are used. In situations where a larger notification is necessary to notify a greater number of property owners, staff indicated that the revised draft ordinance gives the Director the ability to notify any persons beyond the 1500-foot radius who may be affected by the project. The issue of whether or not to require a contingency plan in the event the well runs dry was discussed. Staff responded that there is always a risk to property owners using a well, either for themselves or when sharing with others. There is always a degree of uncertainty due to varying geologic conditions that support the underground water table. However, staff stated that the hydrologic report, flow testing, and recorded covenants would provide appropriate safeguards and warning to property owners who propose to use a shared well. In reality, the only viable contingency plans are to drill a new or deeper well, or to truck in water. The issue of how frequently the well should be inspected to make sure it is fully operational was addressed by staff who reported

that inspections every three years would be adequate to test the water quality and well operation; this is the period that was recommended by DHS and DPW.

Commissioner Modugno then moved to approve the draft ordinance, with the minor changes discussed by the Commission, the related resolution and the Negative Declaration. The motion passed unanimously.



Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning



Planning for the Challenges Ahead

March 31, 2005

James E. Hartl, AICP
Director of Planning

TO: Supervisor Gloria Molina, Chair
Supervisor Yvonne Brathwaite Burke
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

FROM: ^HJames E. Hartl, AICP
Director of Planning

SUBJECT: **REPORT ON THE PROPOSED SHARED WATER WELL
ORDINANCE APPLICATION SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS**
(Motion of February 22, 2005—AGN No. 8)

On February 22, 2005 your Board considered the proposed Shared Well Ordinance amendments to Title 22 (Planning and Zoning) of the County Code. At that time you directed the Department of Regional Planning (DRP) and the Department of Public Works (DPW) to review the application submittal requirements contained in the proposed ordinance and to report back to the Board after our review (see attached motion). The public hearing on the proposed ordinance was continued to April 26, 2005.

Upon staff's review of the ordinance's submittal requirements, we have concluded that some of them can be deleted to achieve a more streamlined ordinance while maintaining public health and safety. Our suggested deletions are listed below. These requirements are found in the proposed ordinance in subsection A (Application Materials) of Section 22.56.1764.

1. **Detailed explanations** related to the sharing of the well (subsection A.1).
Recommendation: Since the required covenant must include the terms and conditions for operation of the well, that requirement should be deleted from the required detailed explanations.
2. **List of property owners** for properties within 1,500 feet (subsection A.2).
Recommendation: This requirement facilitates notice to surrounding property owners and informs them that their written comments on the proposed well can be submitted to the director. The required radius could be reduced to 1,000 feet, which would be twice the notification distance required for most land use permits.
3. **Ownership labels** for owners of properties within 1,500 feet (subsection A.3).
Recommendation: The notification radius should be reduced to 1,000 feet in accordance with the suggestion for item #2.
4. Related **ownership map** to scale (subsection A.4).
Recommendation: The notification radius could again be reduced to 1,000 feet in accordance with the suggestion for item #2.

5. Site plans depicting graphic information needed for case processing (subsection A.5).

Recommendation: The requirements for depicting topography and drainage patterns could be deleted because the DRP can request some or all of such information, as necessary, from the applicant in connection with the required environmental review.

6. Hydrology Report. This report would contain detailed and comprehensive information and projections related to the water quantity and quality of the proposed well (subsection A.6).

Recommendation: This requirement could be replaced with the requirement for submittal of test boring results related to groundwater depth, and well yield, chemical constituent and bacteriology tests that would provide less detailed, but crucial, information about water availability and quality. DRP can require hydrology information from the applicant, if necessary, in connection with the required environmental review, although there may be numerous instances where some or all of such information is not necessary due to already existing reports and studies of the related groundwater basin. This recommendation was prepared in consultation with the Department of Health Services.

7. Approvals from DHS, DPW and Fire Department (subsection A.9).

Recommendation: This requirement should be deleted because subsequent to zoning approval, the applicant must get such approvals from these Departments prior to acquiring a building permit. The need for these approvals will be included in the required covenant.

The suggested actual related changes to the ordinance consistent with the deletions cited above are attached to this Report for your convenience.

A question has also been raised about the status of existing shared water wells. Any shared water well established on or after November 11, 1971 would not be considered to have been lawfully established unless a conditional use permit (CUP) was approved for the well. The owner of such a well who does not have a CUP would have to comply with the provisions of this proposed ordinance if adopted by the Board. Any shared water well established before November 11, 1971 would be considered a nonconforming structure. The owner of such a shared water well could either file for a nonconforming use case or comply with the provisions of the proposed ordinance if adopted by this Board. As a practical matter, existing shared water wells would not be brought to this Department's attention unless the property owner is seeking a permit for a new or expanded development.

We trust that this report meets your needs as expressed in your Board's motion of February 22, 2005. If you have any questions regarding these recommendations or any shared-well-related matter, please call me or Leonard Erlanger of my staff at (415) 974-6432. The Department of Public Works Building and Safety Division was consulted in the preparation of this report.

JEH:RDH:LE

Attachment

1 **SUGGESTED CHANGES TO SHARED WATER WELL**
2 **ORDINANCE CONSISTENT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS**
3 **IN BOARD REPORT DATED MARCH 31, 2005**
4

5 **The suggested changes to the proposed Shared Water Well Ordinance**
6 **consistent with the suggestions in the related Board Report are depicted**
7 **within brackets below. All of the suggested changes relate to application**
8 **submittal requirements, which are contained in subsection A. of Section**
9 **22.56.1764 of the proposed ordinance.**

10
11 **SECTION 4.** Section 22.56.1764 is hereby added to read as follows

12 **22.56.1764 Director's review--Shared water wells.** A director's review
13 for a shared water well shall be subject to the following requirements:

14 A. Application materials. In addition to the application materials
15 specified in Section 22.56.1680, the applicant shall submit the following:

16 1. A detailed explanation of:

17 a. Legal descriptions for each lot or parcel of land that
18 will share the well;

19 b. The existing and proposed uses for each lot or parcel
20 of land that will share the well;

21 c. The number and location of dwelling units, and lots or
22 parcels of land that will share the well. For the purposes of determining the
23 number of dwelling units, a second unit, caretaker's residence (convention:
24 residence or mobilehome), or senior citizens' residence shall each be considered
25 one dwelling unit; however, detached living quarters for the use of temporary
26 guests or servants, or living quarters for servants without kitchens shall not be
27 considered dwelling units;

1 d. The amounts of water that will be available to each
2 dwelling unit that will share the well;

3 e. For each dwelling unit that will share the well, the
4 purposes for which the water will be utilized;

5 **[CHANGE #1: f. — The terms and conditions for the operation of**
6 **the water well, including but not limited to those specified in the covenant**
7 **required in subsection A.8 below; and]**

8 2. A list, certified by affidavit or statement under penalty of
9 perjury, of the names and addresses of all persons who are shown on the latest
10 available assessment roll of the County of Los Angeles as owning the lots or
11 parcel of land that will share the well, and as owning property within a
12 distance of **[CHANGE #2: 1,500 1,000]** feet from the exterior boundaries of the
13 subject lots or parcels of land;

14 3. Two sets of completed mailing labels for the above-stated
15 owners; **[CHANGE #3--CHANGED TO 1,000-FOOT RADIUS PURSUANT TO**
16 **CHANGE IN SUBSECTION 2 ABOVE]**

17 4. A map drawn to a scale specified by the director indicating
18 where all such ownerships are located; **[CHANGE #4—CHANGED TO 1, 00-**
19 **FOOT RADIUS PURSUANT TO CHANGE IN SUBSECTION 2 ABOVE]**

20 5. Site plans. The site plans shall contain a depiction of
21 all of the following items for each lot or parcel of land containing a dwelling unit
22 that will share the well:

23 a. Property lines;

- 1 b. Adjoining street rights-of-way;
- 2 c. The location of all existing and proposed structures
- 3 and land uses;
- 4 d. The location of all existing and proposed dwelling
- 5 units;
- 6 e. The location and depth of all water and sewer
- 7 infrastructure, including but not limited to:
- 8 i. All existing wells, including abandoned wells.
- 9 ii. Any newly proposed well.
- 10 iii. All sewage or waste disposal systems.

11 **[CHANGE #5**

~~f. The topographic elevations and contours;~~

~~g. The drainage patterns; and~~

~~hf.] All existing and proposed easements.~~

14 **[CHANGE #6**

~~6. Hydrology report. A hydrology report showing~~

~~sufficient water supply and quality prepared by a registered civil engineer,~~

~~registered engineering geologist or certified hydrologist with hydrology-~~

~~related experience, as follows:~~

~~a. The hydrology report shall contain the following~~

~~information relating to the quantity and quality of the water necessary to~~

~~supply the dwelling units that will share the well, to the satisfaction of the~~

~~County Department of Health Services, Department of Public Works and~~

~~Fire Department:~~

- 1 ~~_____ i. An evaluation of the amount of water~~
2 ~~available~~
3 ~~in wet, average and dry years;~~
4 ~~_____ ii. The impacts of increased water withdrawals~~
5 ~~on~~
6 ~~the aquifer and biota;~~
7 ~~_____ iii. The reliability of the water source;~~
8 ~~_____ iv. The water quality;~~
9 ~~_____ v. The nature and extent of potential impacts~~
10 ~~on water quality from existing private sewage systems; and~~
11 ~~_____ vi. The sufficiency of water quantity for fire~~
12 ~~protection purposes.~~

13 ~~b. A second peer hydrology report may be required~~
14 ~~at the discretion of the Department of Health Services where questions~~
15 ~~arise as to the accuracy of the initial report. The applicant may choose the~~
16 ~~hydrologist for the peer report, and shall pay for such report.~~

17 **6. Water test results. Test boring results showing**
18 **adequate groundwater depth, and well yield test, chemical constituent test**
19 **and bacteriological test results showing adequate water flows and water**
20 **quality to supply the dwelling units that will share the well to the**
21 **satisfaction of the County Department of Health Services.]**

22 7. Access easement. An access easement granted by the
23 owner(s) of the lot or parcel of land that contains or will contain the shared well,

1 over such lot, in favor of the owner(s) of the immediately adjoining lot(s) or
2 parcel(s) of land containing a dwelling unit that will share the well. Such
3 easement shall be detailed and provide for access to the shared well, and related
4 pumping tank and pipe facilities to the satisfaction of the County Department of
5 Health Services, Department of Public Works and Fire Department. A licensed
6 attorney, licensed surveyor or registered civil engineer shall prepare such
7 easement.

8 8. Covenant. A covenant between all of the owners of lots or
9 parcels of land containing a dwelling unit that will share the well to the
10 satisfaction of the County Department of Health Services, the Department of
11 Public Works, and the Fire Department. Such covenant shall be detailed and
12 shall be prepared by a licensed attorney. It shall include statements that:

13 a. Provide the information specified in subsections A.1.a
14 through **[fe]** above;

15 b. Indicate that the each owner of lots or parcels of land
16 that will share the well accepts responsibility for:

17 i. Submitting a bacteriology report relating to the
18 quality of the well's water every three years subsequent to approval of the well, to
19 the satisfaction of the Department of Health Services, such report to be prepared
20 by a registered civil engineer, registered engineering geologist or certified
21 hydrologist with hydrology-related experience;

22 ii. Submitting a report certifying that the well is
23 fully operational every three years subsequent to approval of the well, to the

1 satisfaction of the Department of Public Works, such report to be prepared by an
2 individual who currently holds a valid class A general engineering contract, C-
3 57 or C-61(D-21) license, and is a California-registered geologist or engineer.

4 c. Require the owner of the lot or parcel of land that
5 contains the well to ensure a continuous flow of water to all dwelling units that will
6 share the well.

7 d. Require that the water from the shared well be used
8 exclusively to provide for the needs of the specified dwelling units, and may not
9 be hauled to other properties that are not included in the covenant; and

10 e. Specify the procedures for modifying and amending
11 the covenant.

12 **[CHANGE #7 f. Indicate that prior to construction of the well all**
13 **necessary permits and approvals must be obtained from the Departments**
14 **of Health Services, Public Works and Fire.**

15 ~~**9. Approvals from other departments. Documents**~~
16 ~~**indicating formal approvals in concept from the Departments of Health**~~
17 ~~**Services and Public Works, and the Fire Department, specifying that the**~~
18 ~~**proposed well will comply with all of their requirements and setting forth**~~
19 ~~**related required conditions of such conceptual approval.]**~~

20 **910.** Assumption of risk. An assumption of risk, waiver of liability,
21 and covenant not to sue the county, its agents, officers, and employees, for
22 damages resulting from approval and imposition of conditions on the application
23 for, and/or the subsequent use of, the shared water well by all owners of the lots

1 or parcels of land that will share the well, and their successors. A licensed
2 attorney shall prepare such document.

3 1011. The director may waive the filing of one or more of the above
4 items with the concurrence of the Department of Health Services, the
5 Department of Public Works and the Fire Department.

6 1112. Any other information the director may deem necessary to
7 make a determination on the pending application.

8

9 Ord Changes for Board Report—3 3/30/05

MOTION BY SUPERVISOR MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH

APRIL 26, 2005

The Shared Water Well Ordinance will establish a new regulatory framework for the proposed sharing of a water well. The requirement for a conditional use permit and a public hearing will be replaced by a discretionary director’s review with significantly reduced fees and shorter processing times. Provisions requiring environmental review, notification of surrounding property owners, and recorded covenants will provide appropriate health and safety safeguards for County residents sharing a water well.

Consistent with the suggestions in the Board Report dated March 31, 2005, submitted by the Department of Regional Planning, the ordinance’s zoning application submittal requirements can be modified without reducing these safeguards. Specifically, the ordinance should be changed in the following ways:

1. The surrounding property owner notification radius should be reduced from 1,500 feet to 1,000, consistent with notification for other discretionary entitlement applications in the 5th District;
2. The Fire, Public Works, and Health Services Department approvals should be deferred to the building permit stage;
3. The comprehensive hydrology report requirement should be reduced to data relating to groundwater depth, well yield and water quality; and
4. The requirement for topographic and drainage information on the plot plan should be deleted.

- M O R E -

MOTION

BURKE _____

YAROSLAVSKY _____

KNABE _____

ANTONOVICH _____

MOLINA _____

I THEREFORE MOVE that the Board of Supervisors:

1. Adopt the attached Negative Declaration (ND) together with any comments received during the public review process, certify its completion, and find that there is no substantial evidence that the proposed amendments will have a significant effect on the environment and that the ND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the County;
2. Approve the recommendations of the Regional Planning Commission to establish new case processing procedures and standards for the sharing of a water well;
3. Determine that the Shared Water Well Ordinance is compatible with and supportive of the goals and policies of the County General Plan and the County's Strategic Plan;
4. Find that adoption of the proposed ordinance would be minimum in its effect on fish and wildlife resources and authorizes the Director of Planning to complete and file a certificate of fee exemption for the project; and
5. Direct County Counsel to prepare a final ordinance for adoption reflecting the proposed amendments with the changes cited above.

#

MDA:pno
sharedwaterwells042605